Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/585,497	MONRO, DONALD M.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Nirav G. Patel	2624
All Participants: Status of Application:		
(1) Nirav G. Patel.	(3)	
(2) Kenneth Eiferman (Reg. No.: 51,647.	(4)	
Date of Interview: <u>15 January 2010</u>	Time: <u>4:45 pm</u>	
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative) Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No If Yes, provide a brief description:		
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed:		
1, 2, 26, 29, 31, 32		
Prior art documents discussed:		
Part II.		
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED: See Continuation Sheet		
Part III.		
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above. 		
/Nirav G. Patel/		
Examiner, Art Unit 2624	pplicant/Applicant's Representati	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The applicant was told of the several 101 problems regarding the method claims (as they fail the machine and transformation test), the codec claims (which are non-statutory as there is no positive limitation excluding a purely software version), the computer program claims (which are stored on a machine-readable data carrier, which is equated to signals, therefore non-statutory) as well as the machine-readable data carrier claims. The applicant was informed about the problems regarding the claims which invoked 112 sixth paragraph (as there is no support for the corresponding structure). The applicants indicated that they prefer an action mailed (instead of Examiner's Amendment), so that the issues could be addressed properly.